UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/798,819	03/11/2004	Eric D. Deily	MS1-1906US	7127

22801   7590   04/06/2009
LEE & HAYES, PLLC
601 W. RIVERSIDE AVENUE
SUITE 1400
SPOKANE, WA 99201

EXAMINER
STACE, BRENT S

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2161	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
04/06/2009	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/798,819	DEILY ET AL.
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit	
	BRENT STACE	2161	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE *3* MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
  Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *11 February 2009*.
2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☐ This action is non-final.
3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1,3,4,6-14,16,18-24,26-33,35,36,38 and 39* is/are pending in the application.
    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
6)☒ Claim(s) *1,3,4,7-14,16,18-24,26-33,35,36,38 and 39* is/are rejected.
7)☒ Claim(s) *6* is/are objected to.
8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on *11 April 2004* is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.
    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
    a)☐ All   b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:
        1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
        2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
        3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1)☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3)☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6)☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Remarks

1.   This communication is responsive to the amendment filed February 11th, 2009.

Claims 1, 3, 4, 6-14, 16, 18-24, 26-33, 35, 36, 38, and 39 are pending. In the

amendment filed February 11th, 2009, Claims 1, 3, 4, 6-11, 14, 16, 18-20, 22, 24, 27,

31-33, and 36 are amended, Claims 2, 5, 15, 17, 25, 34, 37, and 40 are canceled, and

Claims 1, 16, 32, 33, and 36, independent Claims. This action is made FINAL.

Response to Arguments

2.   Applicant's arguments filed February 11th, 2009 with respect to Claims 1, 3, 4, 6-

14, 16, 18-24, 26-33, 35, 36, 38 and 39 have been fully considered but are not

persuasive.

3.   As to the applicant's arguments with respect to exemplary Claim 1 (including

Claims 16, 32, 33, and 36) for the prior art(s) allegedly not teaching or suggesting

"logging by the server a server entry in a server trace log in response to the

detecting of the occurrence of the event in the servicing of the Web request,

wherein the server entry comprises: information descriptive of the occurrence of

the event in the servicing of the Web request; a server event GUID corresponding

to the event; and the Web request GUID corresponding to the Web request;

logging by the Web application an application entry having an application GUID in

an application trace log, wherein each application entry is correlated with each

server entry in the server trace log by a Web request GUID" the examiner

respectfully disagrees. Each limitation will be explained individually below.

For the "**logging by the server a server entry in a server trace log in**

response to the detecting of the occurrence of the event in the servicing of the

Web request, wherein the server entry comprises" limitation, Microsoft, p. 5 bottom

with Microsoft, p. 5 bottom (i.e. counter") with Microsoft, pgs. 1 and 6 were used to

reject this limitation. Generally, the server trace log is the trace.axd file accessed on the

server (for application level tracing) while the application trace log is the output page

with trace information (for page level tracing of each page in the application). Microsoft

teaches in the cited sections that the trace.axd file will collect, by default, 10 requests of

the pages in the application. Each request in the trace.axd is considered a server entry

where each server entry/request has a counter (number) associated with it so that the

collected requests do not exceed the requestLimit (the Duthie reference previously

provided to the applicant explicitly show this counter on p. 4 of 8). These requests in

the prior art are considered as the events.

For the "**information descriptive of the occurrence of the event in the**

servicing of the Web request" limitation, Microsoft, pgs. 6-8 was used to reject this

limitation. These pages show various information all associated with each

request/event (e.g. time, type, etc.). This is all information that is descriptive of the

occurrence of the event in the servicing of the Web request.

For the "**a server event GUID corresponding to the event**" limitation, Microsoft,

p. 5 bottom (i.e. "counter") was used to reject this limitation except where Schaefer, col.

9, lines 8-9 was used to reject "GUID." As discussed above, each server entry/request has a counter (number) associated with it. This, at the least, serves as an ID. Schaefer makes it a GUID so that the benefits of a GUID (discussed in the rejection below) are achieved within the Microsoft prior art.

For the "**the Web request GUID corresponding to the Web request**" limitation, Microsoft, p. 6 (i.e. session ID) was used to reject this limitation except where Schaefer, col. 9, lines 8-9 was used to reject "Web request GUID" and "GUID." Generally, the claimed Web request maps to the reference's session ID. Again, Schaefer makes this session ID a GUID so that the benefits of a GUID (discussed in the rejection below) are achieved within the Microsoft prior art. Microsoft states that the session ID is "The Session Id for this request." This shows that each request corresponds to a session ID, thus at least a correspondence between the Web request and Web request GUID.

For the "**logging by the Web application an application entry having an application GUID in an application trace log, wherein each application entry is correlated with each server entry in the server trace log by a Web request GUID**" limitation, Microsoft, pgs. 1 and 2, (i.e. page level tracing) with Microsoft, pgs. 6 and 7 with Microsoft, p. 6 (i.e. view details) with Microsoft, p. 1 were used to reject this limitation except where Schaefer, col. 9, lines 8-9 was used to reject "GUID." As discussed above, the application trace log corresponds to the output page with trace information (for page level tracing of each page in the application, the view details link). The information making up the page trace information (making application entries) is the claimed application GUID (again, Schaefer makes this application identification

information a GUID so that the benefits of a GUID (discussed in the rejection below) are

achieved within the Microsoft prior art). Alternatively, the Session ID could also be

mapped to the application GUID (again with Schaefer) since each session is an

instance of the application (as known in the art). Additionally, the URL to the

application (Microsoft, p. 5) could be considered an application GUID (again with

Schaefer). Each of these application entries are correlated with each server entry since

one way to get to them is through the trace.axd file (server entry in the server trace log)

by clicking on the view details link. They are correlated by Web request GUID since

each request in the trace.axd file has a Web request GUID/Session ID that must be

referred when viewing the page-level request (with the view details link).

4.   As to the applicant's arguments with respect to exemplary Claim 1 (including

Claims 16, 32, 33, and 36) for the prior art(s) allegedly not teaching or suggesting

"determining which of the information that is descriptive of the occurrence of the

event to put into the server entry or application entry, or both the server entry and

the application entry, as appropriate, as a function of a predetermined level of

verbosity selected from a plurality of levels of verbosity for the Web application

and server" the examiner respectfully disagrees. Microsoft, p. 5, bottom with Microsoft,

p. 1 was used to reject this limitation. In the cited section(s) of Microsoft, Microsoft

teaches that different levels of logging/tracing (showing page output with or without the

trace.axd). These different modes of tracing (true/false) provide for different levels of

verbosity in logging/tracing. Settings need to be changed in order for the different levels

of tracing to be enabled (such as the configuration file (web.config) on page 5 and/or

page level directives for each page, discussed on Microsoft p. 1 and exemplified on

Microsoft, p. 2). Based on these settings, Microsoft determines whether or not to

log/trace the occurrence of some events with the trace.axd. This is "determining which

of the information that is descriptive of the occurrence of the event to put into the server

entry or application entry, or both the server entry and the application entry, as

appropriate" while the settings themselves are "a function of a predetermined level of

verbosity selected from a plurality of levels of verbosity for the Web application and

server." As discussed, on Microsoft, p. 1, page level tracing can be enabled on a per

page basis. However, when application level tracing is enabled, page level tracing is

also enabled (unless there is a page-level directive that explicitly disables it for the

page). Microsoft, page 6 also teaches a ""view details" link" which can be construed as

determining a level of verbosity by viewing additional details of requests made. As

such, the cited sections of Microsoft appear to teach at least the limitations as claimed.

5.   The other claims argued merely because of a dependency on a previously

argued claim(s) in the arguments presented to the examiner, filed February 11th, 2009,

are moot in view of the examiner's interpretation of the claims and art and are still

considered rejected based on their respective rejections from at least a prior Office

action (part(s) of recited again below).

Response to Amendment

Claim Objections

6.   In light of the applicant's respective arguments or respective amendments, the previous claim objections to the claims have been withdrawn. However, new objection(s) is/are warranted by the amendments to the claims.

7.   Claims 14, 38, and 39 are objected to because of the following informality:

a.   Claim 14, as amended now recites "The method as defined in Claim 1, wherein the Web request GUID is unique to the Web request with respect to other said Web requests, and wherein and wherein ." Along with a clear drafting error, it appears that this claim is incomplete.

b.   Claims 38 and 39 both recite "the trace log." It is unclear if the applicant intends this to be the application trace log or the server trace log. Server trace log is assumed since Claims 3 and 4 (similar to Claims 38 and 39) were previously amended to recite "the server trace log."

Appropriate correction is required.

Allowable Subject Matter

8.   Claim 6 is objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

9.   In light of the applicant's respective arguments or respective amendments, the previous 35 USC § 101 rejections to the claims have been withdrawn.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

10.   In light of the applicant's respective arguments or respective amendments, the

previous 35 USC § 112 rejections to the claims have been withdrawn. However, new

rejection(s) are warranted by the amended claims.

11.   The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

> The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of
> making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the
> art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall
> set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

12.   Claims 1, 16, and 33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing

to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter

which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to

one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed,

had possession of the claimed invention. The examiner could not find support in the

specification for the limitations of or similar to "determining which of the information that

is descriptive of the occurrence of the event to put into the server entry or application

entry, or both the server entry and the application entry, as appropriate, as a function of

a predetermined level of verbosity selected from a plurality of levels of verbosity for the

Web application and server."

13.   The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

> The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly
> claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

14.   Claims 4, 11-13, and 36 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

15.   Applicants have amended two types of entries into the claims (application entries and server entries). Claims 4, 11-13, and 36 all recite "the entry." This is now unclear since it is unknown which entry "the entry" is referring to.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

16.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

17.   This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

18.   Claims 1, 3, 4, 6-10, 13, 14, 32, 36, 38, and 39 are rejected under 35 U.S.C.

103(a) as being unpatentable over Microsoft, Tracing Overview, 2002, pages 1-8

(Microsoft) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,157,927 (Schaefer et al.).

For **Claim 1**, Microsoft teaches: "A method comprising:

- servicing a Web request from a Web application; [Microsoft, p. 1]

- associating a …with the Web request, wherein events which happen during

  servicing of the Web request can be identified by the Web request …, [Microsoft,

  p. 6] wherein the servicing comprises executing the Web application that

  interfaces with a server that is servicing the Web request; [Microsoft, pgs. 5 and

  6]

- …detecting the occurrence of an event in the servicing of the Web request during

  the execution of the Web application; [Microsoft, p. 6 i.e., an event in the trace

  category with Microsoft p. 1, additionally, requests can be viewed as events] and

- logging by the server [Microsoft, p. 5 bottom] a server entry … [Microsoft, p. 5

  bottom (i.e. counter")] in a server trace log [Microsoft, p. 5 bottom] in response to

  the detecting of the occurrence of the event in the servicing of the Web request,

  [Microsoft, pgs. 1 and 6] wherein the server entry comprises:

  - information descriptive of the occurrence of the event in the servicing of the

    Web request; [Microsoft, pgs. 6-8]

  - a server event … corresponding to the event; [Microsoft, p. 5 bottom (i.e.

    "counter")] and

- the Web request ... corresponding to the Web request; [Microsoft, p. 6 (i.e. session ID)]

- logging by the Web application [Microsoft, pgs. 1 and 2, (i.e. page level tracing)] an application entry having an application ... in an application trace log, [Microsoft, pgs. 6 and 7] wherein each application entry is correlated with each server entry in the server trace log by a Web request GUID; [Microsoft, p. 6 (i.e. view details) with Microsoft, p. 1] and

- determining which of the information that is descriptive of the occurrence of the event to put into the server entry or application entry, or both the server entry and the application entry, as appropriate, as a function of a predetermined level of verbosity selected from a plurality of levels of verbosity for the Web application and server" [Microsoft, p. 5, bottom with Microsoft, p. 1].

Microsoft discloses the above limitations but does not expressly teach:

- "...Web request Globally Unique Identifier (Web request GUID)...GUID."

With respect to Claim 1, an analogous art, Schaefer, teaches:

- "...Web request Globally Unique Identifier (Web request GUID)...GUID" [Schaefer, col. 9, lines 8-9]

Additionally, all GUIDs are mapped to [Schaefer, col. 9, lines 8-9].

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention having the teachings of Schaefer and Microsoft before him/her to combine Schaefer with Microsoft because the inventions are directed towards logging activities.

Schaefer's invention would have been expected to successfully work well with Microsoft's invention because the inventions use logs containing similar data. Microsoft discloses a way of tracing application usage comprising tracing and logging activities of web applications. However, Microsoft does not expressly disclose that an ID is a GUID. Schaefer discloses methods and apparatus for enabling a component in a first transaction processing environment to access a resource in another environment that is under the control of an XATMI compliant transaction manager comprising a GUID with a transaction.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention having the teachings of Schaefer and Microsoft before him/her to take the GUID from Schaefer and install it into the invention of Microsoft, thereby offering the obvious advantage of being able to represent up to 3.4×10^{38} different numbers/requests (by being 128 bits (or 16 bytes) in length by nature). For applications having many requests/transactions, this can be useful so as not to run out of identifiers for requests/transactions.

Claim 3 can be mapped to Microsoft (as modified by Schaefer) as follows: "The method as defined in Claim 1, wherein the server entry is logged in the server trace log during the servicing of the Web request only when the event is selected from the group consisting of:

- the event pertains of the functionality of authentication;
- the event pertains of the functionality of security;
- the event pertains of the functionality of compression;

- the event pertains of the functionality of a Common Gateway Interface (CGI);

- the event pertains of the functionality of one or more filters" [Microsoft, p. 5,

  requestLimit].

Claim 4 can be mapped to Microsoft (as modified by Schaefer) as follows: "The

method as defined in Claim 1, wherein:

- the entry is logged in the server trace log during the servicing of the Web request

  only when the event pertains to a predetermined filter; [Microsoft, pgs. 1-8 i.e.

  trace property or trace context is defined in the configuration file] and

- the information comprises data going into the predetermined filter and data

  coming out of the predetermined filter" [Microsoft, pgs. 1-8].

Claim 6 is as follows: "The method as defined in Claim 1, wherein at least one of

the detecting and the logging are performed by one or more components of an

operating system of a server, wherein a kernel trace session component of the

operating system of the server performs event buffering to detect when traces are

processed by a kernel when the operating system process a part of the Web request."

Claim 7 can be mapped to Microsoft (as modified by Schaefer) as follows: "The

method as defined in Claim 6, wherein:

- the server services the Web request from the Web application; [Microsoft, pgs. 1-

  8]

- the operating system of the server comprises one or more Application Program

  Interfaces (APIs); [Microsoft, pgs. 1-8]

- the Web application is executed by, or interfaces with, the server; [Microsoft, pgs. 1-8]

- the Web application interfaces with at least one said API to log a Web application event as a Web application entry in the server trace log; [Microsoft, pgs. 1-8]

- the Web application event occurs within the Web application itself; [Microsoft, pgs. 1-8] and

- the Web application entry comprises:

  - information descriptive of the occurrence of the Web application event in the servicing of the Web request by the server when the Web application is running on, or interfacing with, the server; [Microsoft, pgs. 1-8] and

  - the GUID (i.e., Mircrosoft's session id associated with the web request with Schaefer's GUID) corresponding to the Web request" [Microsoft, pgs. 1-8].

Claim 8 can be mapped to Microsoft (as modified by Schaefer) as follows: "The method as defined in Claim 1, wherein:

- a server, having an operating system, services the Web request from the Web application; [Microsoft, pgs. 1-8] and

- at least one of the detecting and the logging are performed by one or more server applications that are executed by the server" [Microsoft, pgs. 1-8].

Claim 9's limitation(s) have already been met by Claim 7's limitation(s). Therefore, Claim 9 is rejected for the same reason(s) as stated above with respect to Claim 7.

Claim 10 can be mapped to Microsoft (as modified by Schaefer) as follows: "The method as defined in Claim 1, wherein filtering is performed on a URL basis, [Microsoft, pgs. 5 and 6] wherein each predetermined level of verbosity corresponds to a different number of data types available for use in logging application entries and server entries, and wherein each data type corresponds to a different kind of data that is descriptive of the particular event." [Microsoft, pgs. 5, 6, and 1].

Claim 13 can be mapped to Microsoft (as modified by Schaefer) as follows: "The method as defined in Claim 1, wherein the Web request GUID or the event GUID is the first portion of the entry" [Microsoft, pgs. 1-8 i.e. the ID is part of the trace record information, first mentioned].

Claim 14 can be mapped to Microsoft (as modified by Schaefer) as follows: "The method as defined in Claim 1, wherein the Web request GUID is unique to the Web request with respect to other said Web requests, and wherein and wherein" [Microsoft, pgs. 1-8 with Schaefer, col. 20, lines 40-42].

For **Claim 32**, Microsoft teaches: "A system having a processor for tracing a Web request on a network, [Microsoft, pgs. 1-8] the system comprising:

- identifying means for identifying when a predetermined event occurs in a predetermined Web request when the predetermined Web request is being serviced; [Microsoft, p. 6 i.e., an event in the trace category and various time stamps] and

- a logging means, in communication with the identifying means, for logging the event in a server trace log as the event happens, [Microsoft, pgs. 1 and 6] wherein the log of the event in the server trace log comprises: …

  - …information descriptive of the occurrence of the event when the predetermined Web request is being serviced, [Microsoft, pgs. 5-8] wherein the logging means is further for determining which of the information that is descriptive of the occurrence of the event to put into the server entry in the server trace log as a function of a predetermined level of verbosity, wherein the level is selected from a plurality of verbosity levels; [Microsoft, p. 5, bottom with Microsoft, p. 1]

- a second logging means, in communication with the identifying means, for logging the event in an application trace log after the event happens, [Microsoft, pgs. 1 and 6] wherein the logging of the event in the application trace log comprises:

  - …information descriptive of the occurrence of the event when the predetermined Web request is being serviced, [Microsoft, pgs. 5-8] wherein the second logging means is further for determining which of the information to put in the application entry as a function of a predetermined level of verbosity, wherein the level is selected from a plurality of verbosity levels; [Microsoft, p. 5, bottom with Microsoft, p. 1] and

- a correlation means for correlating each application entry with each server entry in the server trace log by a Web request GUID" [Microsoft, p. 6 (i.e. view details) with Microsoft, p. 1].

<u>Microsoft discloses the above limitations but does not expressly teach:</u>

- "...a GUID corresponding to the predetermined Web request."

<u>With respect to Claim 32, an analogous art, Schaefer, teaches:</u>

- "...a GUID corresponding to the predetermined Web request" [Schaefer, col. 9, lines 8-9 with Microsoft, pgs. 5-8].

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention having the teachings of Schaefer and Microsoft before him/her to combine Schaefer with Microsoft because the inventions are directed towards logging activities.

Schaefer's invention would have been expected to successfully work well with Microsoft's invention because the inventions use logs containing similar data. Microsoft discloses a way of tracing application usage comprising tracing and logging activities of web applications. However, Microsoft does not expressly disclose that an ID is a GUID. Schaefer discloses methods and apparatus for enabling a component in a first transaction processing environment to access a resource in another environment that is under the control of an XATMI compliant transaction manager comprising a GUID with a transaction.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention having the teachings of Schaefer and Microsoft before him/her to take the GUID from Schaefer and install it into the invention of Microsoft, thereby offering the

obvious advantage of being able to represent up to 3.4×10^{38} different numbers/requests

(by being 128 bits (or 16 bytes) in length by nature). For applications having many

requests/transactions, this can be useful so as not to run out of identifiers for

requests/transactions.

For **Claim 36**, Microsoft teaches: "A server module operating on a server,

[Microsoft, pgs. 1-2] the server module comprising:

- logic stored in a memory configured to service a Web request from a Web

  application operating on the server; [Microsoft, pgs. 1-2]

- logic configured to detect an occurrence of an event in the servicing of the Web

  request; [Microsoft, p. 6 i.e., an event in the trace category with Microsoft p. 1]

  and

- logic configured to log a server entry in a server trace log, [Microsoft, p. 5 bottom]

  wherein the entry comprises:

- information descriptive of the occurrence of the event of the servicing of the Web

  request; [Microsoft, pgs. 6-8] and

- ...corresponding to the Web request, wherein the Web request is associated with

  the Web request, so that events which happen during servicing of the Web

  request can be identified by the Web request... [Microsoft, p. 6] which is logged

  with each of the events; [Microsoft, p. 6]

- logic configured to log an application entry in an application trace log, [Microsoft,

  pgs. 1 and 6] wherein the entry comprises:

- information descriptive of the occurrence of the event of the servicing of the Web request; [Microsoft, pgs. 5-8] and

- … corresponding to the Web request; [Microsoft, p. 6 (i.e. session ID)] and

- logic configured to determine which of the information descriptive of the occurrence of the event to put into the entry as a function of a predetermined level of verbosity, wherein the verbosity is determined by selecting one of a plural of discrete indices, the indices corresponding to human-readable labels, [Microsoft, p. 5, bottom] wherein the descriptive information of the event comprises an event…and human readable text, and wherein event…may be correlated with Web request…" [Microsoft, p. 6 (i.e. view details)].

  Microsoft discloses the above limitations but does not expressly teach:

- "…a Web request Global Unique Identifier (Web request GUID)…GUID."

  With respect to Claim 36, an analogous art, Schaefer, teaches:

- "…a Web request Global Unique Identifier (Web request GUID)…GUID" [Schaefer, col. 9, lines 8-9]

  Additionally, all GUIDs are mapped to [Schaefer, col. 9, lines 8-9].

  It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention having the teachings of Schaefer and Microsoft before him/her to combine Schaefer with Microsoft because the inventions are directed towards logging activities.

  Schaefer's invention would have been expected to successfully work well with Microsoft's invention because the inventions use logs containing similar data. Microsoft discloses a way of tracing application usage comprising tracing and logging activities of

web applications. However, Microsoft does not expressly disclose that an ID is a GUID. Schaefer discloses methods and apparatus for enabling a component in a first transaction processing environment to access a resource in another environment that is under the control of an XATMI compliant transaction manager comprising a GUID with a transaction.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention having the teachings of Schaefer and Microsoft before him/her to take the GUID from Schaefer and install it into the invention of Microsoft, thereby offering the obvious advantage of being able to represent up to 3.4×10^{38} different numbers/requests (by being 128 bits (or 16 bytes) in length by nature). For applications having many requests/transactions, this can be useful so as not to run out of identifiers for requests/transactions.

Claims 38 and 39 encompass substantially the same scope of the invention as that of Claims 3 and 4, respectfully, in addition to a server module and some logic for performing the method steps of Claims 3 and 4, respectfully. Therefore, Claims 38 and 39 are rejected for the same reasons as stated above with respect to Claims 3 and 4, respectfully.

19.   Claims 11, 12, 16, 18-24, 26-31, 33, and 35 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Microsoft, Tracing Overview, 2002, pages 1-8 (Microsoft) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,157,927 (Schaefer et al.), further in view of "Log Explorer Walkthrough" (LogExplorer).

For **Claim 11**, Microsoft (as modified by Schaefer) teaches: "The method as
defined in Claim 1, further comprising generating a report comprising at least a portion
of the information in each said server entry or application entry, as appropriate for which
the Web request or server event GUID in the entry…, wherein the amount of information
in the report is a function of a predetermined level of verbosity selected from a plurality
of levels of verbosity" [Microsoft, pgs. 1-8 i.e., Microsoft teaches storing trace log
information and the logs can be viewed as reports].

Microsoft (as modified by Schaefer) discloses the above limitations but does not
expressly teach: "…matches a supplied ID."

With respect to Claim 11, an analogous art, LogExplorer, teaches: "…matches a
supplied ID [LogExplorer, pgs. 4 and 5].

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of
invention having the teachings of LogExplorer and Microsoft (as modified by Schaefer)
before him/her to combine LogExplorer with Microsoft (as modified by Schaefer)
because both inventions are directed towards loggin data.

LogExplorer's invention would have been expected to successfully work well with
Microsoft (as modified by Schaefer)'s invention because both inventions use log records
containing data. Microsoft (as modified by Schaefer) discloses a way to trace ASP
events/requests comprising GUIDs. However, Microsoft (as modified by Schaefer) does
not expressly disclose reporting and matching on traces using a supplied ID.
LogExplorer discloses a program comprising analyzing and reporting on log data.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of

invention having the teachings of LogExplorer and Microsoft (as modified by Schaefer)

before him/her to take the filtering/analysis features based on an ID from LogExplorer

and install it into the invention of Microsoft (as modified by Schaefer), thereby offering

the obvious advantage of showing only log data that the user is interested in.

Claim 12 can be mapped to Microsoft (as modified by Schaefer and

LogExplorer) as follows: "The method as defined in Claim 11, wherein:

- each said entry is in a binary format; [Microsoft, pgs. 1-8, all database

  management system keeps data in binary format internally since they are on

  computers] and

- the generating of the report further comprises using an event GUID

  corresponding to each said event to map the binary format of each said entry into

  an event description that is in a format that is human readable" [Microsoft, pgs. 1-

  8, specifically, Microsoft, p. 6].

For **Claim 16**, Microsoft teaches: "A computer-readable medium having stored

thereon computer-executable instructions for performing a method, [Microsoft, p. 1] the

method comprising:

- associating a …with a Web request, wherein events which happen during

  servicing of the Web request can be identified by the Web request …, [Microsoft,

  p. 6] wherein the servicing comprises executing a Web application that interfaces

  with a server having an operating system and that is servicing the Web request;

  [Microsoft, pgs. 5 and 6]

- servicing the Web request with a server from a Web application that is executing on the server, [Microsoft, pgs. 5 and 6]

- ...detecting the occurrence of the events during the servicing of the Web request by the server; [Microsoft, p. 6 i.e., an event in the trace category with Microsoft p. 1]

- logging by the server [Microsoft, p. 5 bottom] each of the events as server entries in a server trace log, [Microsoft, p. 5 bottom] wherein each server entry comprises:

  - information descriptive of the occurrence of an event; [Microsoft, pgs. 6-8]

  - an event ... corresponding to the event; [Microsoft, p. 5 bottom (i.e. counter")] and

  - the Web request ... corresponding to the Web request; [Microsoft, p. 6 (i.e. session ID)]

- logging by the Web application [Microsoft, pgs. 1 and 2, (i.e. page level tracing)] an application entry having an application ... in an application trace log, [Microsoft, pgs. 6 and 7] wherein each application entry is correlated with each server entry in the server trace log by a Web request GUID; [Microsoft, p. 6 (i.e. view details) with Microsoft, p. 1] and

- determining which of the descriptive information to put into the server entry or application entry, or both the server entry and the application entry, as appropriate, as a function of a predetermined level of verbosity selected from a

plurality of levels of verbosity for the Web application and server" [Microsoft, p. 5,

bottom with Microsoft, p. 1].

Microsoft discloses the above limitations but does not expressly teach:

- "...Web request Globally Unique Identifier (Web request GUID)...GUID

- ...wherein during the servicing multiple logger streams are simultaneously active

  to log the events as the Web request is being serviced by the server."

  With respect to Claim 16, an analogous art, Schaefer, teaches:

- "...Web request Globally Unique Identifier (Web request GUID)...GUID"

  [Schaefer, col. 9, lines 8-9]

  Additionally, all GUIDs are mapped to [Schaefer, col. 9, lines 8-9].

  With respect to Claim 16, an analogous art, LogExplorer, teaches:

- "...wherein during the servicing multiple logger streams are simultaneously active

  to log the events as the Web request is being serviced by the server"

  [LogExplorer, p. 3 with Microsoft, pgs. 1-8, specifically, pgs. 5-6].

  It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the

invention having the teachings of Schaefer, LogExplorer's, and Microsoft before him/her

to combine Schaefer and LogExplorer's with Microsoft because the inventions are

directed towards logging activities.

  Schaefer's and LogExplorer's invention would have been expected to

successfully work well with Microsoft's invention because the inventions use logs

containing similar data. Microsoft discloses a way of tracing application usage

comprising tracing and logging activities of web applications. However, Microsoft does

not expressly disclose that an ID is a GUID or multiple logger streams. Schaefer

discloses methods and apparatus for enabling a component in a first transaction

processing environment to access a resource in another environment that is under the

control of an XATMI compliant transaction manager comprising a GUID with a

transaction. LogExplorer discloses a program that tracks requests to a database

comprising the ability to browse, export, report, and filter multiple log's log data

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of

invention having the teachings of Schaefer and Microsoft before him/her to take the

GUID from Schaefer and multiple logs from LogExplorer and install them into the

invention of Microsoft, thereby offering the obvious advantage of presenting a single

virtual log file including transactions from all the log files/streams included and the

obvious advantage of being able to represent up to 3.4×10^{38} different numbers/requests

by using GUIDs (by being 128 bits (or 16 bytes) in length by nature). For applications

having many requests/transactions, this can be useful so as not to run out of identifiers

for requests/transactions.

Claims 18 and 19's limitation(s) have already been met by Claims 3 and 4's

limitation(s), respectfully. Therefore, Claims 18 and 19 are rejected for the same

reason(s) as stated above with respect to Claims 3 and 4, respectfully.

Claim 20 can be mapped to Microsoft (as modified by Schaefer and

LogExplorer) as follows: "The computer-readable medium as defined in

Claim 16, wherein the further comprises at least one of:

- activating the logging when the logging is deactivated; [Microsoft, pgs. 1-8] and

- deactivating the logging when the logging is activated" [Microsoft, pgs. 1-8].

Claim 21 can be mapped to Microsoft (as modified by Schaefer and LogExplorer) as follows: "The computer-readable medium as defined in Claim 20, wherein the activating and the deactivating are performed remotely from the server" [Microsoft, pgs. 1-8 with LogExplorer, p. 3].

Claim 22 can be mapped to Microsoft (as modified by Schaefer and LogExplorer) as follows: "The computer-readable medium as defined in Claim 20 wherein the server trace log is in a remote location from the server" [LogExplorer, p. 3].

Claims 23, 24, and 26-30's limitation(s) have already been met by Claims 6, 7, and 9-13's limitation(s), respectfully. Therefore, Claims 23, 24, and 26-30 are rejected for the same reason(s) as stated above with respect to Claims 6, 7, and 9-13, respectfully.

Claim 31 can be mapped to Microsoft (as modified by Schaefer and LogExplorer) as follows: "The computer-readable medium as defined in Claim 16, wherein the Web request GUID is unique to the Web request with respect to other said Web requests, [Microsoft, pgs. 1-8 with Schaefer, col. 9, lines 8-9] and wherein the Web request is for at least one of: a static file; a Common Gateway Interface (CGI); and an active server page (ASP)" [Microsoft, pgs. 1-8].

For **Claim 33**, Microsoft teaches: "A network environment comprising a server having a processor …, [Microsoft, pgs. 1-8] the server servicing Web requests from a Web application [Microsoft, p. 1] while performing Web request-based tracing to produce traces in a server trace log [Microsoft, p. 6] … and to flow each Web request

GUID from the server across to the application, [Microsoft, pgs. 1-8] wherein the Web

application produces traces in a Web application trace log, [Microsoft, pgs 6-8] wherein

the traces in the server trace log and the Web application trace log comprise information

that is descriptive of events which occur during the servicing of the Web request by the

server and the Web application, [Microsoft, pgs. 5-8] wherein the information in the

traces is determined in part as a function of a predetermined level of verbosity, wherein

the level is selected from a plurality of levels of verbosity for the server and the Web

application, [Microsoft, p. 5, bottom with Microsoft, p. 1] and wherein the Web

application can correlate each event in the Web application trace log with a server GUID

from the server by a Web request GUID" [Microsoft, p. 6 (i.e. view details) with

Microsoft, p. 1].

Microsoft discloses the above limitations but does not expressly teach: "...and

multiple simultaneously active logger streams that are concurrently running on the

server and that are each trace-enabled...that comprise a Web request GUID for each

Web request."

With respect to Claim 33, an analogous art, LogExplorer, teaches: "...and

multiple simultaneously active logger streams that are concurrently running on the

server and that are each trace-enabled" [LogExplorer, p. 3 with Microsoft, pgs. 1-8,

specifically, pgs. 5-6].

With respect to Claim 33, an analogous art, Schaefer, teaches: "...that comprise

a Web request GUID for each Web request" [Schaefer, col. 9, lines 8-9 with Microsoft,

p. 6].

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the

invention having the teachings of Schaefer, LogExplorer's, and Microsoft before him/her

to combine Schaefer and LogExplorer's with Microsoft because the inventions are

directed towards logging activities.

Schaefer's and LogExplorer's invention would have been expected to

successfully work well with Microsoft's invention because the inventions use logs

containing similar data. Microsoft discloses a way of tracing application usage

comprising tracing and logging activities of web applications. However, Microsoft does

not expressly disclose that an ID is a GUID or multiple logger streams. Schaefer

discloses methods and apparatus for enabling a component in a first transaction

processing environment to access a resource in another environment that is under the

control of an XATMI compliant transaction manager comprising a GUID with a

transaction. LogExplorer discloses a program that tracks requests to a database

comprising the ability to browse, export, report, and filter multiple log's log data

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of

invention having the teachings of Schaefer and Microsoft before him/her to take the

GUID from Schaefer and multiple logs from LogExplorer and install them into the

invention of Microsoft, thereby offering the obvious advantage of presenting a single

virtual log file including transactions from all the log files/streams included and the

obvious advantage of being able to represent up to 3.4×10^{38} different numbers/requests

by using GUIDs (by being 128 bits (or 16 bytes) in length by nature). For applications

having many requests/transactions, this can be useful so as not to run out of identifiers

for requests/transactions.

Claim 35 can be mapped to Microsoft (as modified by Schaefer and

LogExplorer) as follows: "The network environment as defined in Claim 33, wherein the

server returns each said trace from the multiple logger streams to a corresponding said

trace-enabled Web application for which the Web request was serviced by the server"

[Microsoft, pgs. 1-8, specifically, p. 5 the trace.axd file].

Conclusion

20.   Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Brent S. Stace whose telephone number is 571-272-8372 and fax number is 571-273-8372. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 9am-5:30pm EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Apu M. Mofiz can be reached on 571-272-4080. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

/B. S./
Examiner, Art Unit 2161

/Apu M Mofiz/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2161